# PSYCHOLOGICAL DISPOSITIONS AS DETERMINANTS OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOR

**A**

Synopsis submitted for the proposed research project

Towards the partial fulfillment of the

Requirement for the degree of

## P.hD, PSYCHOLOGY

September, 2011.


Submitted By:

**Shalini Sisodia**

Under the supervision of:

**Prof. (Mrs.) Ira Das**

Head Department of Psychology

Faculty of Social Science. D.E.I

**Department of Psychology, Faculty of Social Sciences**
**Dayalbagh Educational Institute (Deemed University)**
**Dayalbagh Agra- 282005**

# INTRODUCTION

Today with fast developing computer and internet era and increasing trend toward globalization traditional management views are changing rapidly. Although the usage of technology increases, the demand for human skills is still at a considerable level, because employees have high impact over organizations. The best way of increasing organizational performance is by increasing the performance of the employees working in the organizations. Organizational commitment is getting more attention because it aims to improve the general performance of the organization, through increasing the involvement of each employee to overall progress in organizational flows. This is an era of hyper competition and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is found to lead the overall success of the organization. Its importance is evident by considering the fact that it guides in understanding the commitment of employees with the organization, especially to remain competitive. The aim of the present study is to examine the role or contribution of egotism in the determination of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior and to study the contribution of personality variables in predicting organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

## Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment or employee loyalty is the degree to which an employee identifies with the organization and wants to continue participating actively in it (Charlene, 1986). Organizational commitment has a positive impact on job performance (Steers, 1977, Mathieu and Zajac 1990; and Meyer and Allen, 1977), attendance (Meyer and Allen, 1977), job satisfaction (Cooper and Viswesvaran, 2005) and motivation (Mathieu and Zajac, 1990). It is negatively related to turnover, intent to leave, tardiness and absenteeism (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001 and Cohen, 2003). Some research studies have conceptualized organizational commitment as either an attitudinal or a behavioral construct (Becker, 1960 and Mowday et al, 1982) while others have conceptualized it as a multidimensional construct (Allen and Meyer, 1990 and Jaros et al, 1993).

Employees who are committed to their organization are happy to be its members, believe in and feel good about the organization and what it stands for, and intend to do what is good for the

organization (George and Jones, 1996). Organizational commitment refers to the strength of an employee's involvement in the organization and identification with it. According to Mowday et al, 1982 a strong organizational commitment is characterized by: -

1. The extent to which an employee demonstrates a strong desire to remain with the organization.

2. The degree of willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization

3. Belief in and acceptance of the organization's goals and values.

Organizational commitment goes beyond loyalty to include an active contribution to accomplish organizational goals. The organizational commitment attitude is determined by a number of personal variables such as age, tenure in the organization, and positive and negative affectivity, or internal or external control attributions etc. and organizational variables such as job design and the leadership style of one's supervisor etc (Luthans et al, 1987). Organizational factors that affect commitment are job enrichment, autonomy, opportunity to use skills, positive attitudes towards work group and diversity. Role ambiguity, role conflict, organizational climate and the degree of openness to organizational change are other factors that might have an impact on the levels of organizational commitment (Robinson et al, 1990). Even non-organizational factors such as the availability of alternatives after making the initial choice to join an organization affect subsequent commitment (Northcraft and Neale, 1990).

According to Morrow (1983), job commitment is a function of personal characteristics and situational factors related to the job setting. Staff demographic characteristics (age, gender, and education), work values and attitudes toward the job, job and organizational climate perceptions, and personality variables may be among the factors that influence job commitment.

Allen and Meyer (1991) have proposed three-component model of organizational commitment. Which includes:

1. Affective Commitment
2. Continuance Commitment
3. Normative Commitment

Malhotra et al (2007) concluded from their study that the three components of organizational commitment were not independent of each other, since continuance commitment led to normative commitment and normative commitment further led to affective commitment. Ko et al, (1997) and Jaros (1993) concluded low correlation between continuance commitments (low perceived alternative) and the other dimensions of organizational supports mentioned in previous studies.

Jooliden and Yeshodhara. (2009) investigated the organizational commitment of teachers in India and Iran. Results revealed that Indian teachers had better organizational commitment in the affective and normative components and Iranian components. Taing et al. (2010) found that continuance commitment based on economic exchanges was related favorably to work phenomena, such as task performance and citizenship behaviors.

Natarajan (2011) explored the relationship of organizational commitment with job satisfaction. It was concluded that employee exhibiting high degree of normative commitment may enjoy intrinsic job satisfaction and the ones exhibiting high degree of continuance commitment may enjoy extrinsic and total job satisfaction.

Organizational commitment greatly affects several key aspect of work behavior.

- Absenteeism and voluntary turn over: High levels of organizational commitment tend to be associated with low levels of absenteeism and voluntary turn over. In most cases more committed individuals are less likely to look for new jobs then less committed ones. Tett and Meyer (1989) discovered strong relationships between staff commitment and both job satisfaction and job turnover. A relationship has also been found between organizational commitment and the level of absenteeism. In a Canadian sample of managers in the food service industry. Research suggests that employees who exhibit organizational commitment are happier at their work, spend less time away from their jobs and are less likely to leave the organization. Findings from the studies of two different occupational groups (hospital and retail employees) suggest that organizational commitment is positively linked to job performance (Mowday et al, 1979).

- Willingness to share and make sacrifices: Organizational commitment is associated with high levels of willingness to share and make sacrifices. Ekmekçi (2011) indicated that job involvement of individuals in the workplace have important effect on organizational commitment.

Noms and Niebuhr et al. (2002) studied on professionalism, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in accounting organization. Data were collected from several field offices of a "Big Eight" U.S. accounting firm. The result showed that Accountants who reported high levels of professionalism also reported high levels of organizational commitment. Additionally, both professionalism and organizational commitment were strongly related to job satisfaction.

Cohen (2010**)** examined how individual values and organizational commitment are related to teachers' participation in an optional change program in the Israeli educational system. Result showed that organizational commitment had a stronger effect on participation in the reform than individual values.

**Factors influencing organizational commitment**

- Job characteristic: Research has shown that organizational commitment is affected by various jobs characteristic, for example, commitment tends to be greater when people have high levels of responsibility over the jobs they performed. Flynn and Tannenbaum (1993) conducted a study on "Private and public sector managers, who were compared regarding their job characteristics and organizational commitment. He hypothesized That job characteristics would be positively related to commitment and that sector Would moderate that relationship . Moderated regression analysis revealed partial support for both hypotheses. The existence of clarity and challenge were positively related to commitment. Job characteristics demonstrated a stronger relationship with commitment among private sector managers.

- Nature of reward: An employee's commitment is also likely to be influenced by the nature of rewards he or she receive, for example, feeling of commitment is enhanced by the use of a profit- sharing plan.

- The employment opportunities: Organizational commitment is affected by the existence of

alternative employment opportunities. Zaleska and Gratton (2000) suggested that commitment and trust are derived from fair career opportunities. The result show that locus of control does not have a significant impact on organizational commitment while managerial level promotes the same. However, managerial level does not promote organizational commitment amongst bank employees with internal locus of control.

Basir and Ramay (2008) showed that career opportunity and work life policies in IT professionals are significantly correlated with organizational commitment, while job characteristics do not determine their organizational commitment. Organizations will have to devise more family friendly policies and provide opportunities for career development to IT professionals to induce organizational commitment

- Personal characteristics: Personal characteristics also influence organizational commitment, for example, people who have more tenure with their organization are more highly committed to them than those who have been employed for shorter periods (Miner, 1992).

Tiwari and Mishra (2008) revealed that work stress related to interpersonal, physical condition and job interest was found higher in officer class than clerks and4thclassemployees respectively. Furthermore, long job tenure group reported more interpersonal stress than their short job tenure counterparts. Despite this, health problems were found more in clerks than in 4th class employees and officers respectively. Contrary to this, the organizational commitment was identified higher in officers than clerks and 4thclass respectively. Furthermore, short job tenure group showed higher level of commitment than long job tenure group. According to Miner (1992) work stress was found to be inversely related with affective, normative and overall commitment. Further, illness was found to be negatively correlated with affective, continuance, normative and overall commitment. The affective, normative and overall commitments were predicted by stress related to physical condition and health (illness).

## Organizational citizenship behavior

Dennis Organ is generally considered the father of organizational citizenship behavior. Bateman and Organ (1983) first coined the term. Organ's definition of organizational citizenship behavior includes three critical aspects that are central to the organizational citizenship behavior:

1. Organizational citizenship behaviors are thought of as discretionary behaviors, which are not part of the job description, and performed, by the employee as a result of personal choice

2. Organizational citizenship behaviors go above and beyond that which is an enforceable requirement of the job description.

3. Organizational citizenship behavior contributes positively to overall organizational effectiveness.

Organ (1994**)** referred to a person who engages in organizational citizenship behavior as a "good soilder". The presence of these behaviors has consistently been shown to benefit both individual and organizational outcomes. Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) is defined as those extra work-related behaviors which go above and beyond the routine duties prescribed by their job descriptions or measured in formal evaluations (Bateman and Organ, 1983). Since these efforts are made beyond the requirements specified in the job description, their presence cannot be enforced (Organ, 1988), and their absence cannot be penalized (Van Dyne et al., 1995). Examples of these efforts include cooperation with peers, performing extra duties without complaint, punctuality, volunteering and helping others, using time efficiently, conserving resource, sharing ideas and positively representing the organization (Turnipseed and Rassuli, 2005).

Organ and Ryan (1995) found a modest relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. This relationship was stronger than the relationship between job satisfaction and in-role performance. OCB impacts workgroup efficiency during times of crisis management. For example, having conscientiousness and helping others result in decreased inter-group conflict and allow managers

to focus on more pressing matters (MacKenzie et al, 1999). Having workers highly engaged in OCB may improve managers' efficiency by allowing them to devote a greater amount of time to long-range planning matters. Subsequently, managers benefit from positive OCB as well as employees (Turnipseed and Rassuli, 2005).

According to Turnipseed and Rassuli (2005), OCB elements which enhance performance include: elements which add social capital, helping or altruistic elements, elements resulting with time savings or problem solving, and other elements which provide socio-emotional support by boosting morale or developing a nurturing culture. Walz and Niehoff (1996) argue that only the helping-type of citizenship behavior element of OCB is linked to performance, while Karambayya (1990) suggests that more OCB elements are found in high-performing workgroups compared to low-performing workgroups.

**Dimensions of organizational citizenship behavior**

Organ (1988) deconstructed the dimension of general compliance and added additional dimensions of OCB. This deconstruction resulted in a five-factor model consisting of altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, civic virtue, and sportsmanship.

1**.** Altruism: - Altruism is defined by discretionary behaviors that have the effect of helping a specific work colleague with an organizationally relevant task or problem. In a study by Podsakoff, Ahearne, and MacKenzie, (1997) indicated that helping behavior and sportsmanship had significant effects on performance quantity and that helping behavior had a significant impact on performance quality. However; civic virtue had no effect on either performance measure.

2. Courtesy: - Courtesy has been defined as discretionary behaviors that aim at preventing work-related conflicts with others (Law et al., 2005). This dimension is a form of helping behavior, but one that works to prevent problems from arising. It also includes the word's literal definition of being polite and considerate of others (Organ et al., 2006).

3. Conscientiousness: - Conscientiousness, sometimes referred to as compliance, reflects the genuine acceptance and adherence of workplace rules, regulations, and procedures.

Conscientiousness consists of behaviors that go well beyond the minimum role requirements of the organization (Law, Wong, & Chen, 2005). These behaviors indicate that employees accept and adhere to the rules, regulations, and procedures of the organization.

4. Civic virtue: - Civic virtue refers the active involvement, interest, and participation in the life of their organization, such as functions, events, and meetings. Civic virtue is characterized by behaviors that indicate the employee's deep concerns and active interest in the life of the organization (Law et al., 2005). This dimension also encompasses positive involvement in the concerns of the organization (Organ et al., 2006).

5. Sportsmanship: - Sportsmanship describes employees who are willing to tolerate difficulties in the workplace that are intended to improve the organization, abstaining from unnecessary complaints and criticisms. Sportsmanship has been defined as willingness on the part of the employee that signifies the employee's tolerance of less-than-ideal organizational circumstances without complaining and blowing problems out of proportion.

The importance of organizational citizenship behavior is extremely high in present scenario when employees are changing jobs very frequently for getting higher salaries and "minimax theory" is accepted by majority of employees i.e. minimum of expenditure of resources such as energy, time etc and maximum of gain from the organization where the employee is working. That is why organizational citizenship behavior is rare to be found.

Bachrach, et al. (2007) examined how task interdependence influences the importance of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) in employee performance evaluations in China and the USA. Results support the moderating effects of national culture (both using a country proxy and as a measure of collectivism) on the affects of task interdependence. Although among evaluators from the USA perceptions of the importance of OCB increased as task interdependence increased, the effects of task interdependence were significantly attenuated among evaluators from China.

There are several benefits of organizational citizenship behavior in organization. Which are as follows:

1. Organizational citizenship behaviors may enhance the efficiency of an organization.
2. Organizational citizenship behaviors may also improve organizational performance.
3. Organizational citizenship behaviors may also help to enhance an organization's ability to adapt to changing environment.

Jain (2009) examines the predictive ability of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) and Emotional Intelligence (EI) with regard to organizationally relevant criterion variables including Job Satisfaction, Personal Effectiveness, Reputational Effectiveness, General Health, Career Orientation, Perceived Job Mobility, Turnover Intention, Organizational Commitment, Vertical Trust, Work Recognition, Organizational Productivity, and Organizational Effectiveness. Result suggested that compared to EI, OCB was found to be relatively a more powerful predictor of organizationally relevant criterion variables in Indian work context.

**Antecedents of organizational citizenship behavior**

- Job satisfaction: - Organ and Ryan (1995) conducted a meta-analysis of 28 studies and found a modest relationship between job satisfaction and OCB. This relationship was stronger than the relationship between job satisfaction and in-role performance. Tsai and Wu (2010) explored the relationships between organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction and turnover intention. The results reveal that the nurses' job satisfaction has a significantly positive correlation with organizational citizenship behavior and a negative correlation with turnover intention. This study has proven that the turnover intention of clinical nurses is related to their organizational citizenship behavior and job satisfaction.
- Organizational commitment: - Organizational commitment, and leader supportiveness are found to correlate with OCB at about the same rate as satisfaction (Organ & Ryan, 1995). Yilmaz and Cokliuk-Bokeoglu (2008) determined that the teacher had positive perceptions about organizational citizenship and organizational commitment. There was a moderate positive relationship between the teachers' perceptions about organizational citizenship and organizational commitment.

Williams and Anderson (1991) examined the relative contributions of components of job satisfaction and organizational commitment to the performance of OCBs. Factor analysis of survey data from 127 employees' supervisors supported the distinction between in-role behaviors and two forms of OCBs. Hierarchical regression analysis found two job cognitions variables (intrinsic and extrinsic) to be differentially related to the two types OCBs, but affective variables and organizational commitment were not significant predictors.

- Personality characteristics: Some studies have shown that personality traits, such as agreeableness, are related to these behaviors (see Borman, Penner, Allen, & Motowidlo, 2001; Konovsky & Organ, 1996; Organ & Ryan, 1995).

  Singh and Singh (2009) conducted on 188 front level managers to examine the role of personality in organizational citizenship behavior. The results of coefficient of correlation indicate that Conscientiousness and extraversion dimensions of personality were found to be significantly positively correlated with all the five dimensions of OCB. Agreeableness dimension of personality was significantly positively correlated with all the five dimensions of OCB except civic virtue. Neuroticism dimension of personality was significantly negatively correlated with sportsmanship, courtesy and altruism dimensions of OCB.

- Task characteristics: Research has shown how characteristics of the tasks, such as autonomy, might correspond to organizational citizenship behavior (e.g., Piccolo & Colquitt, 2006; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, & Bommer, 1996). Gellatly and Irving (2001) found that jobs high in autonomy were more likely to be associated with the appearance of OCB. Further, they discovered that when autonomy was low, conscientious workers were less likely to display OCB.
- Leadership behavior: The behavior of leaders and managers also affects the prevalence of these acts (Pillai, Schriesheim, & Williams, 1999; Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Fourth, employee attitudes towards the job and organization (Bateman & Organ, 1983; Konovsky & Pugh, 1994; Organ & Ryan, 1995), as well as perceived justice and fairness (Moorman, 1991; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993) also affect the incidence of organizational citizenship behavior.

Bacharch,Powell, Bendoly, and Richey (2006) found that OCB was considered more important when work tasks required collaboration among workers or within work teams. It does seem that OCB is largely a social phenomenon. OCB, in contrast, is more informal and is defined as "behaviors that go beyond task performance and technical proficiency, instead supporting the organizational, social, and psychological context that serves as the critical catalyst for tasks to be accomplished" (Borman, 2004).

Deutsch Salamon and Deutsch (2006) suggested that employees use OCB to get noticed by managers and signal their "unobservable capabilities." Luthans (2002) suggests another possible reason for the interest in OCB. He proposed that one may be seeing a trend toward emphasizing the more positive aspects of the work experience rather than the more neutral (task performance) or negative (counterproductive work performance) ones.

Posdakoff and MacKenzie (1994) suggested that one reason managers value OCBs is that they believe OCBs contribute to organizational success. The results show that OCBs make an important contribution to overall agency performance; however, some citizenship behaviors appear to help and others hinder agency performance. Finally, a comparison of the results of the two studies suggests that managers tend to overvalue some citizenship behaviors and undervalue others.

Cohen (2000) examined the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) and general citizenship behavior in the wider society. Path analysis using LISREL VIII supports the notion that contextual work attitudes mediate the effect of general citizenship on OCB. The prime implication is that the organization constitutes an important factor in determining whether general citizenship behavior will be transformed in the organization.

Bukhari, Ali, Bashir and Shahzad (2001) focused on the effects of Altruism, Conscientiousness, and Civic Virtue (three of the antecedents of Organizational Citizenship Behavior -OCB) and their relationship with Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) in the Corporate Sector of Pakistan. As per previous studies we have hypothesized a direct and significant relationship between the antecedents chosen and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Results prove that all the above mentioned antecedents have significant positive relationship with OCB.

Yen and Niehoff (2004) discovered that organizational citizenship behaviors do indeed correspond to customer satisfaction. Yen and Niehoff (2004) delineated several mechanisms that could underpin this association between organizational citizenship behaviors and customer satisfaction. Altruism, for example, might facilitate cooperation amongst employees and thus more effective coordination, ultimately improving the service to customers. Conscientiousness and courtesy ensures that employees are cognizant of recent developments, which can also facilitate customer satisfaction. Finally, civic virtue or voice behavior uncovers ideas and insights that could improve the interface between employees and customers as well as optimize products and services.

Kumar and Raj (2009) conducted a study on LIC managers. It was found that intrinsic motives and goal internalization act as important predictors of OCB. Positive affectivity also plays a significant role; which determines if the employees will exhibit such behaviors or not. Desire to help others without expecting anything in return i.e. personal motive emerged as another important cause. In all the cases, job satisfaction and commitment found to be highly interrelated to organizational citizenship.

Vey and Campbell (2009) examined the extra-role nature of behavioral items from a popular measure of Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). They presented with a list of both OCB items and items reflecting in-role behaviors, a majority of participants (85% or more: N = 248) categorized 17 of 30 OCBs as in-role work behaviors. Items tapping OCBs in the conscientiousness and courtesy dimension were considered in-role more frequently than items in other OCB dimensions. Negative relationships between supervisory experience and the propensity to view altruism, courtesy, and sportsmanship OCBs as in-role were found.

Marinova, Moon and Dyne (2010) integrated conceptual model of organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) that combined two dominant distinctions in types of OCB (individual versus organizational target and promotive versus protective orientation). Results from four non-overlapping samples representing over 1550 employees support systematic similarities and differences between four specific types of OCB: helping, taking charge, compliance, and sportsmanship.

Wang (2011) tested the relationships between value/identity-based motivation (VIM) and the five dimensions of organizational citizenship behaviour (OCB) as well as the moderating effects of individualistic/collectivistic orientation on the relationships between VIM and OCB dimensions. The results supported the hypothesized relationships between VIM and sportsmanship, civic virtue, courtesy, and altruism but failed to support the expected relationship between VIM and conscientiousness and the moderating effects.

Bergeron diane, et al. (2011) suggested that relationships among organizational citizenship behavior (OCB), task performance, and individual career outcomes are necessarily positive. These findings suggest that relationships between OCB and outcomes are more complex than originally thought and that boundary conditions may apply to conclusions drawn about the outcomes of OCB.

Motevallizadeh and Zakiani (2011) studied the five aspects of an Organizational Citizenship Behavior through an organization's point of view. Research findings showed that strengthening the Organizational Citizenship Behavior which is the goal of an organization, is dependent on the Organization's Justice with the mediation of the Organization's Health Personality.

Kashif, Khan and Rafi (2011) focused on identifying the determinants of OCB and their relationships with each other in the telecommunication sector of Pakistan. Age of the employees and the individual dispositions were found to have minimal impact on defining the OCB.

**Personality traits as a determinants of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.**

It is expected that personality factors have important role in the determination of an employee's job commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Under similar organizational set up, employees are differently committed to their jobs due to their different personality domains or dimensions.

The "Big Five" factors (or Five Factor Model; FFM) of personality are five broad domains or dimensions of personality which are used to describe human personality. The five-factor model

of personality is a hierarchical organization of personality traits in terms of five basic dimensions: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism(McCrae and Costa, 1985; and McCrae and John, 1992) (common acronyms are OCEAN, NEOAC, or CANOE). Neuroticism, extraversion, openness to experience, agreeableness, and conscientiousness are known as the big five personality traits in psychology. The FFM has piqued the interest of many personality psychologists, and indeed the work of Costa and McCrae (1985, 1992) is one of the most noteworthy. They describe the five personality traits as follows: Neuroticism (N) is the opposite of emotional stability. People high on the N scale tend to experience such negative feelings as emotional instability, embarrassment, guilt, pessimism, and low self-esteem. People scoring high on the extraversion (E) scale tend to be sociable and assertive, and they prefer to work with other people. Openness to experience (O) is characterized by such attributes as open-mindedness, active imagination, preference for variety, and independence of judgment. People high on the agreeableness (A) scale tend to be tolerant, trusting, accepting, and they value and respect other people's beliefs and conventions. Finally, people high on the conscientiousness(C) scale tend to distinguish themselves for their trustworthiness and their sense of purposefulness and of responsibility. They tend to be strong-willed, task-focused, and achievement-oriented.

The Big Five factors and their constituent traits can be summarized as OCEAN:

1. Openness – Openness is a general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination, curiosity, and variety of experience. People with low scores on openness tend to have more conventional, traditional interests. They prefer the plain, straightforward, and obvious over the complex, ambiguous, and subtle.
2. Conscientiousness – Conscientiousness is a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement against measures or outside expectations. The trait shows a preference for planned rather than spontaneous behavior. It influences the way in which we control, regulate, and direct our impulses.
3. Extraversion – Extraversion is characterized by positive emotions, surgency, and the tendency to seek out stimulation and the company of others. Extraverts enjoy being with

people, and are often perceived as full of energy. Introverts simply need less stimulation than extraverts and more time alone. They may be very active and energetic, simply not socially.

4. Agreeableness – Agreeableness is a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others. Agreeable people also have an optimistic view of human nature. They believe people are basically honest, decent, and trustworthy. Disagreeable individuals place self-interest above getting along with others. They are generally unconcerned with others' well-being, and are less likely to extend themselves for other people.
5. Neuroticism – Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, or depression. It is sometimes called emotional instability. Those who score high in neuroticism are emotionally reactive and vulnerable to stress. At the other end of the scale, individuals who score low in neuroticism are less easily upset and are less emotionally reactive.

Organ (1994) suggested an effect of job attitudes on organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) would also argue for an effect due to personality. It is also plausible that personality could explain the correlation between job attitudes and OCB. A review of the research on personality measures and OCB does not support the case for dispositional affectivity as an important determinant of OCB. A stronger case emerges for the role of some variant of Conscientiousness, although results indicate that the best predictor of OCB is not a 'factorially pure" dimension of the Big Five, but a constellation or profile of personality facets drawn from different factors of the Big Five.

Neuman and Kickul (1998) investigated the effects of personality variables as antecedents in predicting Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCBs), with the covenantal relationship as a mediating variable. 284 retail sales employees were administered 4 personality tests, a composite measure of the covenantal relationship, and a measure of citizenship behavior. Value for achievement, agreeableness, and conscientiousness predicted five types of organizational citizenship. Extraversion was not predictive across all citizenship behaviors.

Witt, et al. (2002) suggested that the highly conscientious workers, those low in agreeableness were found to receive lower ratings of job performance than workers high in agreeableness. One

explanation for lack of an interaction between conscientiousness and agreeableness in the other 2 samples is that those jobs were not characterized by frequent, cooperative interactions with others. Overall, the results show that highly conscientious workers who lack interpersonal sensitivity may be ineffective, particularly in jobs requiring cooperative interchange with others.

Tani, et al. (2003) indicated Friendliness and Emotional Instability as the strongest distinguishing personality factors among the participant roles, followed by Conscientiousness and Energy. Higher levels of Emotional Instability and lower levels of Friendliness typified both Pro-bullies and Victims, relative to their peers. Victims were also low in Conscientiousness. Defenders exhibited high levels of Friendliness, whereas Introversion and Independence characterized Outsiders. These results suggest that personality traits might contribute to children's typical behaviour in bullying situations.

Lounsbury (2003) found that Extraversion and Teamwork Disposition were related to job and career satisfaction contravenes job descriptions and career planning advice suggesting that independent, introverts are better suited for IT work. Given that adult personality is antecedent to work experiences, it was suggested that future research proposing to show the effects of work-related factors such as pay and challenge on job or career satisfaction should first control for personality traits.

King, George and Hebl (2005) revealed significant interactions between conscientiousness, on the one hand, and agreeableness, extraversion, and emotional stability, on the other, in predicting helping behaviors. Clarifying the relationship between personality and helping, these results suggest that the impact of conscientiousness in a social context depends on a positive interpersonal orientation.

Barrick, et al. (2005) described extraversion as key dispositional determinant of social behavior. People who are high in extraversion are generally sociable, assertive, active, bold, energetic, adventuresome, and expressive (Goldberg, 1992). Thus, those who are highly extraverted display more flexible behaviors that make them more likely to show OCB.

Zhang (2006) suggested that it is meaningful to investigate intellectual styles in addition to examining personality. In addition, results supported Sternberg's assertion regarding the validity of the theory of mental self-government in both academic and non-academic settings.

Erdheim, et al. (2006) explored the linkages between the five-factor model of personality and Meyer and Allen's (1991) model of organizational commitment using a field sample. Results indicated that extraversion was significantly related to affective commitment. Neuroticism, conscientiousness and openness to experience were all significantly related to continuance commitment. Lastly, Agreeableness was significantly related to normative commitment.

Jensen-Campbell and Malcolm (2007) examined how conscientiousness contributes to adolescents' positive peer relationships and vulnerability to poorer ones. Adolescents higher on conscientiousness experienced less victimization, better quality friendships, and higher peer acceptance even after controlling for the other Big Five dimensions. Externalizing and/or attention problems mediated the link between conscientiousness and peer relations. Conscientiousness moderated the relation between internalizing problems and poor interpersonal functioning. Results suggest that self-control processes associated with conscientiousness are important in developing and maintaining relationships in adolescence.

Templer (2011) has shown that personality can partly explain job satisfaction. Results confirmed that extraversion, conscientiousness, non-neuroticism (emotional stability), and also agreeableness were related to job satisfaction.

The investigator therefore assumes that personality traits have important role in determining organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

**Egotism as a determinant of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Citizenship Behavior.**

The term "egotism" is derived from the Latin *ego*, meaning "self" or "I", and *-ism*, used to denote a system of belief. Egotism may coexist with delusions of one's own importance, even at the denial of others.

Egotism is an inflated sense of “importance” or “greatness”, i.e.: someone who goes around declaring how great he is. Whereas egoism is simply motivated by self-interest. An egotist is someone who is stuck on him or herself, and feels superior to everyone else in all aspects of the personality. Egotism is when you care about yourself and your own welfare and have an exaggerated opinion of your own importance.

Egotism, then, is a mask we wear to hide the faults or weaknesses we believe we have. The foundation of egotism is the delusion that we're different, the delusion that some of us are better than others. But our mask will fall aside of its own accord once we realize that we are all the same. We share the same fears, hopes, and dreams. Once we understand that, there is nothing to fear, nothing to get upset about.

Egotism is the tendency to speak or write of oneself excessively and boastfully. It is an exaggerated belief and inflated sense of one’s own importance. Egotism is characterized by an exaggerated estimate of one’s intellect, ability, importance, appearance, wit, or other valued personal characteristics- is the drive to maintain and enhance favorable views of oneself (Kowalski, 1997).

“In egotism we find the person filled with an overweening sense of the importance and qualities of his personality....the things of the “Me” (Atkinson, 2010). Egotism means placing oneself at the center of one’s world with no concern for others, including those loved considered as ‘close”, in any other terms except those set by the “egotist”.

Egotists believe that if they will not do the work, it cannot be done, this is their illusion. Infact work is being done even in their absence. A few facts about egotism are sufficient to save us from the lure of egotism. These are:-

- Egotism is harmful to one’s personal growth.
- The result of egotism is the opposite of what one seeks: That is, instead of showing how great we are, it merely broadcasts our own self-doubt or insecurity.
- Egotism turns others off; one loses friends: Egotists are not merely people who think too much of themselves; they're also people who think too little of others.

- Egotism is not justified**:** A person becomes competent only by receiving help from others. Instead of boasting, one should express his gratitude for the help one has received by offering help to others.

- Egotism Results in Withdrawal from Society: The sin of egotism always takes the form of withdrawal. When personal advantage becomes paramount, the individual passes out of the community, especially spiritual community, where men are related on the plane of sentiment and sympathy and where, conscious of their oneness, they maintain a unity not always commensurable with their external unification.

Ahamkara is a Sanskrit term that is related to the ego and egoism - that is, the identification or attachment of one's ego. The ego is therefore an obstacle to spiritual progress Aham (Ego) within youngsters provokes them to be disobedient. Ahamakar is not mere self pride or arrogance, which it is in a very narrow sense, but the very feeling of separation that makes one feel distinct and different from the rest of the creation and the Creator.

Stephan, et al. (1976) found that males competing against males or females and females competing against females took more credit for success than they gave successful opponents and blamed themselves less for failure than they blamed their opponents for failing. Females competing against males, however, did not make these egotistical attributions. When the Ss accounted for their opponents' outcomes, males were given more credit for success and were blamed less for failure than were females. It is suggested that females playing against males were not egotistical because they did not believe they were as competent at a masculine task as were their male opponents.

Weary, et al. (1980) investigated the relationship between affect and self-attributions following positive (P) and negative (N) behavioural outcomes. Principal findings were that (a) Ss made greater attributions to self for P than for N outcomes; (b) both during and following performance, P outcome Ss reported more P and less N affect than did N outcome Ss; (c) both during and following performance, P outcome Ss reported greater feelings of egotism than did N outcome Ss; and (d) under N outcome conditions, high publicity Ss made lower self-attributions and subsequently also reported greater feelings of egotism than did low publicity Ss.

Gollwitzer, et al. (1982) investigated the influence of outcome-related affect on subsequent causal attributions. Findings show that Ss preferred internal factors to explain success, whereas external factors were blamed for failure. Ego-defensive attributions following failure and ego-enhancing attributions following success were more pronounced in the 5-min condition than in the other conditions. Results support the idea that outcome-related affect mediates egotistical performance attributions.

Cunningham (1984) conducted a study on "egotism and in-group favoritism" led to the hypothesis that residents of Sydney suburbs would overvalue the prestige of their own suburb as compared with ratings by non-residents, particularly in low-prestige suburbs. In 12 of 30 local government areas (LGAs), residents rated suburbs in their "home" LGA significantly higher than non-residents did; this was also true when ratings were summed over all 30 LGAs. More importantly, 10 of these 12 LGAs were in the lower half of the rank order of mean LGA prestige.

Miller and Schlenker (1985) examined the attributional egotism of individuals may be particularly important when they serve as members of cooperative groups. Within a group one's fellow members may be granted or denied credit for a group performance in order to manipulate one's own perceived responsibility for the outcome. In this study, group members privately or publicly reported their assessments of their own and others' responsibility for group successes and failures. Subjects privately claimed more responsibility for success than for failure but did not do so (in public) when the other members were expected to see their reports. Moreover, under public conditions, subjects claimed less responsibility for a group success than they gave to the other members, an effect which disappeared in private. Subjects were clearly sensitive to the interpersonal implications of their attributions, displaying less egotism under public condition.

Salmivalli, et al. (1999) explored that Self-and peer-evaluated SEs were significantly correlated, whereas defensive egotism was not connected to either self-or peer-evaluated SE. Adolescents' SE profiles were associated with their behaviour in bullying situations; these connections were stronger among boys than among girls. Bullying others and assisting or reinforcing the bully were typical of adolescents with so-called defensive SE. Defending the victims of bullying was typical of adolescents with genuine high SE. Being victimized by peers was most typical of

adolescents with low SE and, among girls, of those in the cluster the authors named “humble pride”.

Jones, et al. (2002) showed that people preferred their own name letters even when these letters were relatively rare. Furthermore, the name-letter and birthday-number preferences of high and low self-esteem participants diverged in response to an experimentally manipulated self-concept threat. It was concluded that implicit egotism, specifically name-letter and birthday-number preferences, represent a form of unconscious self-regulation.

Shiell, A. & Seymour, J. (2002) suggested strong altruistic support for publicly funded health care even among those whose self-interest is better served by tax-financed incentives to take out private insurance.

Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (2003) suggested that “threatened egotism” is an important cause of violent behavior. The results show that egotism is positively associated with violent and nonviolent delinquency and that this relationship holds when a number of important predictors of delinquency are controlled, including social control and self-control.

Snyder, et al. (2007) concluded after people work on unsolvable problems, they often perform poorly on a subsequent task. Egotism explains this decrement as the result of a strategy of low effort designed to blunt an attribution of poor ability should failure occur on the new task. Unlike egotism, the negativity hypothesis predicts that adding an allegedly facilitating element will worsen performance. 50 college students were given either solvable or unsolvable concept formation problems and then worked on anagrams with or without music said to be distracting. In addition, there was a 5th condition in which Ss were given unsolvable problems followed by music said to facilitate performance.

Newman, et al. (2009) conducted a study on “implicit egotism”. It indicates that people tend to react positively to anything that reminds them of themselves, including their own names and the letters in their names. Names can have effects (presumably unconscious ones) even on people's choices of mates and careers.

Pelham, et al. (2011) criticized the field studies of implicit egotism and has argued that there is theoretical reason to believe that implicit egotism should be valid only in the laboratory.

The investigator therefore assumes that egotism have important role in determining organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. Employees with high egotism may have low organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

Since none of the above mentioned studies show a contribution of egotism and personality traits in the determination of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, the following objectives were made.

# METHODS

## AIM

To study the contribution of personality traits and egotism in the determination of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

## HYPOTHESES

1. There exists no significant correlation between personality traits and organizational commitment.
2. There exists no significant correlation between personality traits and organizational citizenship behavior.
3. There exists no significant correlation between egotism and organizational commitment.
4. There exists no significant correlation between egotism and organizational citizenship behavior.

## OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF THE TERM USED

### Egotism

Egotism is an inflated sense of "importance" or "greatness", i.e.: going around declaring how great a person is. Egotism is an inflated, perhaps untenable or unstable, view of self. Egotism is typically operationalzed as narcissism (Bushman and Baumeister, 1998, 2002).

## Personality traits

Personality traits refer to enduring patterns of thought, emotion, and behavior that are not likely to change over time and explain people's behavior across different situations (Costa & McCrae, 1989; Funder, 2001).

**Five Domains of personality traits:-**

**Openness** – Openness is a general appreciation for art, emotion, adventure, unusual ideas, imagination, curiosity, and variety of experience.

**Conscientiousness** – Conscientiousness is a tendency to show self-discipline, act dutifully, and aim for achievement against measures or outside expectations.

**Extraversion** – Extraversion is characterized by positive emotions, surgency, and the tendency to seek out stimulation and the company of others.

**Agreeableness** – Agreeableness is a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative rather than suspicious and antagonistic towards others.

**Neuroticism** – Neuroticism is the tendency to experience negative emotions, such as anger, anxiety, or depression.

## Organizational commitment

Organizational commitment refers to the strength of an employee's involvement in the organizational and identification with it. Strong organizational commitment is characterized by a belief in and acceptance of the organizations goals and values, a willingness to exert considerable effort on the organization and a desire to remain with the organization. (Mowday, et al, 1982)

## Organizational citizenship behavior

Organ (1988), defines OCB as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes effective

functioning of the organization…the behaviorism not enforceable requirement of the role or the job description … the behavior is a matter of personal choice".

## JUSTIFICATION OF THE PROBLEM

The purpose of the present study is to examine the contribution of egotism and personality traits in the determination of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. The investigator is curious to know whether there is a significant relation between egotism and organizational commitment and between egotism and organizational citizenship behavior or also whether there is a significant relation between personality traits and organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior. The present study would also help in determining which factors are responsible for determination of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior and also be helpful in indicating which type of personality is best for the higher organizational citizenship behaviors and organizational commitment.

## VARIABLES:

- **Predictor Variable**: - (1). Egotism

  (2). Personality Traits: (i). Neuroticism

  (ii). Extraversion

  (iii).Openness

  (iv). Agreeableness

  (v). Conscientiousness

- **Criterion Variable**: - (1). Organizational commitment

  (2). Organizational citizenship behavior:

- **Relevant Variable**: -

  Age – age range of employees would be between 25 to 50 yrs

Sex – only male employees would be taken in the sample.

Education – at least graduate employees would be taken in sample.

Tenure in the organization- At least 5 years experience in the organization.

## RESEARCH DESIGN

In the present research a Correlational design would be made to study the contribution of personality traits and egotism in the determination of organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior.

## SAMPLE

The study will be conducted on a representative sample of 200 employees, who work in different organizations in Agra. All the employees would be randomly selected out of the total number of organizations in Agra. The organizations to be included would be industrial and bank employees etc. The test will be administered on 200 employees taken randomly from each organization in the population. Employees to be selected in the sample will be at least graduates and their age range would be between 25 to 50 yrs.

## TOOLS

The following tools will be used to measure the I.V. and D.V. For the study, four scales will be used, which are as follows:

- **Egotism scale -**

Egotism Scale (enclosed herewith) is constructed by the investigator herself. It consists of 30 items in Hindi language.

**Scoring:** In the scoring of Egotism scale every item responded as tick (√) was given a score of '1' and the item left out or not responded was given a score of '0' the total score is number of ticks. The option or item that indicated higher egotism was given higher score. The scores given were 1 or 0. It was decided the higher the scores higher the egotism. Items no 3, 4 & 16 has reverse scoring 0 or 1. The minimum score of the egotism scale is '0' and the maximum score is '30'.

**Validity:** For a test to be good it must be valid. Criterion related validity coefficient of egotism scale against the criterion of teachers was found to be r = .65 which is highly significant. So the egotism scale is highly valid.

**Norms:** Standard score norms (Z score) were calculated on a sample of 200 cases.

- **Neo five-factor inventory-**

The Revised NEO Personality Inventory, or NEO PI-R, is a psychological personality inventory; a 240-item measure of the Five Factor Model: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness to Experience. Additionally, the test measures six subordinate dimensions (known as 'facets') of each of the "FFM" personality factors. The test was developed by Paul T. Costa, Jr. and Robert R. McCrae for use with adult (17+) men and women without overt psychopathology. The short version, the NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI), has 60 items (12 items per domain).

The internal consistency of the NEO FFI (the 60 item domain only version) was high, at: N= .79, E= .79, O= .80, A= .75, C= .83. Test retest reliability of the NEO PI-R is also good. The test retest reliability of an early version of the NEO after 3 months was: N= .87, E= .91, O= .86. The test retest reliability reported in the manual of the NEO PI-R over 6 years was: N= .83, E= .82, O= .83, A= .63, C= .79. The discriminate validity and criterion validity has been established for these scales.

- **Organizational commitment scale**

This scale was developed by Allen and Meyer (1990). This scale comprises of three components and has total 24 items. Respondents are required to rate items on a 7 point Likert scales, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

The components covered by this scale are as follows:

1. Affective commitment scale (ACS)

2. Continuance commitment scale (CCS)

3. Normative commitment scale (NCS)

Scores range from 0 to 6 in accordance to 7 point Likert scale. However, reverse scoring (6 to 0) was done for the items no. 4,5,6,8,9,15,18,19,23,29. The discriminate validity has been established for these scales. The reliability for each of the three scales was as follows: ACS: .87, CCS: .75, NCS: .79.

- **Organizational citizenship behavior**

The 24 item OCB scale developed by Podsakoff, et al. (1990) was utilized to assess five dimensions of OCB proposed by Organ (1988). These dimensions were altruism, conscientiousness, courtesy, sportsmanship and civic virtue. The item ratings were obtained from a seven point Likert scale that had responsiveness ranging from 1= 'Strongly Disagree' to 7= 'Strongly Agree'. The ratings indicated the extent that each of the behaviors' was a characteristic of the employee's behavior. Internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's Alpha) for whole scale was found to be 0.85. Alpha was found to be0.67 for Conscientiousness, 0.71 for Sportsmanship, 0.67 for Civic Virtue, 0.76 for Courtesy and 0.71 for Altruism dimension.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Multiple Regression Analysis will be use in the present study.

# REFERENCES


- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1990).The Measurement and Antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of occupational Psychology, 63* (1) 1-18.

- Allen, N.J. & Meyer, J.P. (1991).Further assessments of a three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 12* (1) 61-89.
- Atkinson, W.W (2010). *The New Psychology*, 30.

- Bachrach, D. G., Powell, B. C., Collins, B. J., & Richey, R. G. (2006). Effects of task interdependence on the relationship between helping behavior and group performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91* (2), 1396-1405.

- Bachrach, D.G., Wang, H., Bendoly, E. & Zhang, S. (2007). Importance of organizational citizenship behavior for Overall Performance Evaluation: Comparing the Role of Task Interdependence in China and the USA. *Management and Organization Review, 3* ( 2), 255-276,

- Barrick, M. R., Parks, L., & Mount, M. K. (2005).Self-Monitoring as a moderator of the relationship between personality traits and performance. *Personnel Psychology, 58,* 745-767.

- Basir, S. & Ramay, M.I. (2008). Determinants of organizational commitment a study of information Technology professionals in Pakistan. *International Review of Business Research Papers, 9* (2) 49-59.

- Bateman, T. S., & Organ, D. W. (1983). Job satisfaction and the good soldier: The relationship between affect and employee "citizenship." *Academy of Management Journal, 26*(4), 587-595.
- Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L. & Boden, J. (2003). "Relation of Threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of self-esteem". *Psychological Review, 103*, 5-37.
- Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology, 66* (1) 32-42.
- Bergeron, D.M., Shipp, A. J., Rosen, B. & Furst , A.F. (2011). Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Career Outcomes: The Cost of Being a Good Citizen. *Journal of Management*.
- Borman, W., Penner, L., Allen, T., & Motowidlo, S. (2001). Personality predictors of citizenship performance. *International journal of selection and assessment.*
- Borman, W.C. (2004). The Concept of Organizational Citizenship. Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, Inc. Tampa, Florida, and University of South Florida.
- Bukhari, Z.U., Ali, U., Basir, S. & Shahzad, K. (2001). Organizational citizenship behavior in Pakistan.
- Bushman, B.J., & Baumeister, R.F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? Journal of *Personality and Social Psychology, 75,* 219–229.
- Bushman, B.J., & Baumeister, R.F. (2002). Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Research in Personality, 36,* 543–545.

- Campbell, W.K., Bonacci, A.M., Shelton, J., Exline, J.J., & Bushman, B.J. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a new self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 83*, 29–45.

- Carlyle, (1795-1881). "A Quote on Egotism is the source and summary of all faults and miseries.

- Charlene, M.S. (1986). The loyalty Factor. *Personnel Journal*, 52-62.

- Cohen, A. & Vigoda, E. (2000). Do good citizens make good organizational citizens? An empirical examination of the relationship between general citizenship and organizational citizenship behavior in Israel. *Administration and society, 32*(5), 596-624.

- Cohen, A. (2003). Multiple commitments in the work place: *An Integrative Approach*, Mahwan, and New Jersy: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

- Cohen, A. (2010). Individual values, organizational commitment and participation in a change: Israeli Teachers' Approach to an Optional Educational Reform. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 1-12.

- Cooper, H.A. & Viswesvaran, C. (2005). The construct of work commitment: Testing an integrative framework. *Psychological Bulletin 131* (2) 241-259.

- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1989). NEO-PI *Professional Manual.* Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Costa, P.T., & McCrae, R.R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

- Cunningham, J.D. (1984). Egotism in prestige ratings of Sydney suburbs: Where I live is better than you think. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 14*(3) 429 – 438.

- Deutsch Salamon, S. D., & Deutsch, Y. (2006). OCB as a handicap: An evolutionary psychological perspective. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 27,* 185–199.

- Einstein, A. (1879-1955). "A Quote by on interdependence, work, community, and giving, 8.

- Ekmekci, A.K. (2011). A study on involvement and commitment of employees. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research, 3* (3), 68-73.

- Erdheim, Jesse, Wang, M.O. & Ziekae, M.J. (2006). Linking the big five personality constructs to organizational commitment. *Personality and Individual differences, 41* (5) 959-970.

- Flynn, D.M. & Tannenbaum, S.I. (1993). Correlation of organizational commitment: Differences in the public and private sector. *Journal of Business and psychology, 8* (1) 103-116.
- Funder, D.C. (2001). Personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 197-221.
- Gellatly, I. R., & Irving, P. G. (2001). Personality, autonomy, and contextual performance of managers. *Human Performance, 14,* 232-245.

- George, J.M. & Jones, G.R. (1996). Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior. Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 12.

- Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big Five factor structure. *Psychological Assessment, 4,* 26-42.

- Golwitzer, P.M., Earle, W.B. & Stephan, W.G. (1982). Affect as a determinant of egotism: Residual excitation and performance attributions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 43* (4), 702-709.

- Jain, A.K. (2009). Exploring the relative relevance of organizational citizenship behavior and emotional intelligence. *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 35* (1), 87-97.

- Jaros, S.J, Jermier, J.M., Kochler, J.N. & Sincicn (1993). Effects of Continuance, Affective and Moral Commitment on the with drawl process: An Evaluation of eight structural Equation Models. *Academy of management Journals, 36* (5) 951-995.

- Jensen-Campbell, L.A. & Malcolm, K.T. (2007). The Importance of Conscientiousness in Adolescent Interpersonal Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33* (3), 368-383.

- Jones, J.T., Pelham, B.W., Mirenberg, M.C., & Hetts, J.J. (2002). Name letter preferences are not merely mere exposure: Implicit egotism as self-regulation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 38,*170–177.

- Jooliden, F. & Yeshodhara, K. (2009). Organizational commitment among high school. Teachers of Indian and Iran. *Journal of Educational Administration, 47* (1) 127-136.

- Karambayya, R., (1990). Good organization citizens do make a difference. *Proceedings of the Administrative Sciences of Canada,* 110-119.

- Kashif, M. , Khan, Y. & Rafi, M. (2011). An Exploration of the Determinants of OCB in the Telecommunication Sector of Pakistan. *Asian Journal of Business Management 3*(2) 91-97.

- King, E., George, J., and Hebl, M. (2005). Linking Personality to Helping Behaviors at Work: An Interactional Perspective. *Journal of Personality, 73* (3).

- Ko, J.W., Price, J.L. & Mueller, C.W. (1997). Organizational commitment in the South Korea. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82* (6) 961-973.

- Konovsky, M. A., & Organ, D. W. (1996).Dispositional and contextual determinants of Organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *17*, 253–266.

- Konovsky, M. A., & Pugh, S. D. (1994). Citizenship behavior and social exchange. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 656-669.

- Kowalski Ed, R.M. (1997). *Aversive Interpersonal Behaviors*, 112.

- Kumar, A. & Raj, L. (2009). Identification of causes of organizational citizenship behavior: A Qualitative study of LIC Managers. Indian ///journal of Social Science, 6 (2), 17-28.

- Law, S. K., Wong, C., & Chen, X. Z. (2005). The construct of organizational citizenship behavior: Should we analyze after we have conceptualized? In D. L. Turnipseed (Ed.), Handbook of organizational citizenship behavior (pp. 47–65). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Leary, M.R. (2007). *The Curse of the Self*, 91.

- Lounsburry, J.W., Loveland, J.M., Sundstrom, E., Gibson, L.W., Drost, A.W., & Hamrick, F. (2003). An investigation of personality traits in relation to career satisfaction. *Journal of Career Assessment, 11* (3), 287-307.

- Luthans, D.B (1987). Organizational commitment: Analysis of Antecedents. *Human Relations, 40* (4) 219-236.

- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Paine, J. E. (1999). Do citizenship behaviors matter more for managers than for salespeople? *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 27*, 396-410.

- Malhotra, N., Budhwar, P., & Procose, P. (2007). Linking Rewards to commitment: An Empirical investigation of focus UK call centers. *The International Journal of Human Resource management, 18* (12) 57-75.

- Marinova, S.V., Moon, H. & Dyne, L.V. (2010). Are all good soldier behaviors the same? Supporting multidimensionality of organizational citizenship behaviors based on rewards and roles. *Human Relation, 63* (10), 1463-1485.
- Mathieu, J.E. & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A Review and Meta – Analysis of the Antecedents, correlates and consequences of organizational commitment. *Psychological Bulletin, 108* (2) 171-194.

- McCrae, R.R. and Costa, P.T. (1985). Comparison of EPI and Psychoticism scales with measures of the five-factor model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 6* (5), 587-597.

- McCrae, R.R.; John, O.P. (1992). "An introduction to the five-factor model and its applications". *Journal of Personality, 60* (2): 175–215.
- Meyer, J.P. & Allen, N.J. (1997). Commitment in the Work place: *Theory, Research and Application,* Sage Publication, thousand Oaks, CA.

- Meyer, J.P. & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the work place: Toward a general Model. *Human resource Management Review, 11* (3) 299-326.

- Meyer, J.P. and Allen, N.J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1* (1), 61-89.

- Miller, R.S. & Schlenker, B.R. (1985). Egotism in group member: Public and Private Attributions of responsibility for group performance. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 48* (1) 22-35.

- Miner, J.B. (1992). Industrial organizational Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 124-128.

- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855.

- Morrow, P. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: *The case of a Work commitment Academy of Management Review, 8, 486*-500.
- Motevallizadeh, S. & Zakiani, S.H. (2011). Studying role of Organizational justice and Organizational health personality in Deputy of Research and Technology, Ministry of Health and Medical Education, Tehran, Iran. Journal of American Science, 7(7).

- Mowday, R.T., Steers R.M. & Porter, L.W. (1979). The measure of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14* (3), 224-47.

- Mowday, R.T.; Steers R.M. & Porter, L.W. (1982). The measure of organizational Commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14* (3); 224-47.

- Nataranjan, N.K. (2011). Relationship of organizational commitment with job satisfaction. Indian Journal of Commerce & Management Studies, 11(1), 2229-5674.

- Neuman, G. A., & Kickul, J. R. (1998).Organizational citizenship behaviors: Achievement orientation and personality. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 13*, 263–279.

- Newman, L., Hernandez, W., Bakina, D., & Rutchick, A. (2009). Implicit Egotism on the Baseball Diamond: Why Peter Piper Prefers to Pitch for the Pittsburgh Pirates. *A Journal of Onomastics, 57,* (3), 175-179.

- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.

- Noms, D.R. & Niebuhr, R.E. (2002). Professionalism, organizational commitment and job satisfaction in accounting organization, *Accounting Organization and Society*, *9* (1) 49-59.

- Northcraft, G.B. & Neale, M.A. (1990). Organizational Behavior. Chicago: Dryden. 475.

- Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behavior: The good soldier syndrome.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- Organ, D. W. (1994). Personality and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Management*, 20, 465–478.

- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, *48*(4), 775-802.

- Organ, D. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie S. P. (2006). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature, antecedents, and consequences. London: Sage Publications.

- Paulhus, D.L., Robins, R.W., Trzesniewski, K.H., & Tracy, J.L. (2004). Two replicable suppressor situations in personality research. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *39*, 303–328.

- Pelham, Brett, Carvallo & Mauricio (2011). The surprising potency of implicit egotism: A reply to simonson. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(1) 25-30.

- Piccolo, R. F., & Colquitt, J. A. (2006). Transformational leadership and job behaviors: The mediating role of core job characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 49, 327-340.

- Pillai, R., Schriesheim, C. A., & Williams, E. S. (1999). Fairness perceptions and trust as mediators for transformational and transactional leadership: A two-sample study. *Journal of Management, 25*, 897-933.

- Podsakoff, P. M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1994).Organizational citizenship behavior and sales unit effectiveness. *Journal of Marketing Research, 31*, 351-363.

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Bommer, W. H. (1996). A meta-analysis of the relationships between Kerr and Jermier's substitutes for leadership and employee job attitudes, role perceptions, and performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 380-399.

- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers 'trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly, 1*,107-142.

- Robinson, D.; Simourd L. & Porporino F. (1990). Research on Staff Commitment: A Discussion Paper. www.csc.scc.gc.ca/text/ copyright_e.shtml.

- Salmivalli, c., Kaukiainen, A., Kaistaniemi, L., Lagerspetz, K.M.J. (1999). Self-evaluated, Self esteem, Peer-evaluated Self-Esteem. And Defensive Egotism as predictors of adolescents' Participation in Bulling situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25* (10), 1268-1278.

- Schmalhausen, S.D. (2004). *Why We Misbehave*, 55.

- Shiell, A. & Seymour, J. (2002). Preference for public health insurance: Egotism or altriuism? *International Journal of Social Economics, 29* (5), 356-369.

- Singh, A.K. & Singh, A.P. (2009). Does Personality Predict Organizational Citizenship Behaviour among Managerial Personnel? *Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 35*, (2) 291-298.

- Snyder, M.L., Smoller, B., Strenta, A. & Frankel, A. (2007). A comparison of egotism, negativity, and learned helplessness as explanations for poor performance after unsolvable problems. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 15* (4) 445-449.

- Steers, R.M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment, *Administrative Science Quarterly, 22* (1) 46-56.

- Stephan, W.G., Rosenfield, D. & Stephan, C., Texas, U. & Austin (1976). Egotism in males and females. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34* (6), 1161-1167.

- Taing, M.U., Granger, B.P., Groff, K.W., Jackson, E.M., & Johnson, R.E. (2010). "The Multidimensional nature of Continuance Commitment: Commitment owing to economic exchanges versus lack of employment alternatives", *Journal of Business and Psychology, 1* (16) 16.

- Tani, F., Greenman, P.S., Schneider, B.H. & Fregoso. (2003). Bullying and the Big FiveA Study of Childhood Personality and Participant Roles in Bullying Incidents. International Journal of Social Psychology, 24 (2), 131-146.

- Templer, K.J. (2011). Five-Factor Model of Personality and Job Satisfaction: The importance of agreeableness in a tight and collectivistic Asian society.60(4), 1464-0597.

- Tett, R. & Meyer, J. (1989). Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Turnover Intention, and Turnover: *A Meta-Analytic Review*. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada.

- Tiwari, S.K. & Mishra, P.C. (2008). Work stress and health as predictors of organizational commitment. Journal of the Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 34 (2), 267-277.

- Tsai, Y. and Wu, S.-W. (2010). The relationships between organizational citizenship behavior, job satisfaction and turnover intention. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 19*, 3564–3574.
- Turnipseed, D., & Rassuli, A. (2005). Performance Perceptions of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors at Work: a Bi-Level Study among Managers and Employees. British *Journal of Management, 16*, 231–244.
- Van. D.L., Grahm, J., & Dienesch, r. (1194). Organizational citizenship behavior: Construct redefinition, Measurement and Validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 37* (4), 765-802.
- Vey, M.A. & Campbell, J.P. (2009). In role or extra-role organizational citizenship behavior: Which are we measuring? *Human Performance*, 200-1791.
- Walz, S. M., & Niehoff, B. P. (1996). Organizational citizenship behavior and their effect on organizational effectiveness in limited menu restaurants. *Academy of Management Best Paper Proceedings, 56th Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, OH*, 307-311.
- Wang, L., Howell, J.P., Hinrichs, K.T. & Prieto, L. (2011). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Role of Value/Identity-Based Motivation. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 18* (1) 14-24.
- Weary, G. (1980). Examination of affect and egotism as mediators of bias in causal attributions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38* (2), 348-357.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management, 17,* 601-617.
- Witt, L. A., Burke, L. A., Barrick, M. R., & Mount,M. K. (2002). The interactive effects of conscientiousness and agreeableness on job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 161-169.

- Yen, H., & Neihoff, B. (2004). Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational effectiveness: Finding relationship in Taiwanese banks. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*, (8), 161 7-1 637.

- Yilmaz, K. & Cokluk-Bokeoglu, O. (2008). Organizational citizenship behavior and organizational commitment in Turkish Primary Schools. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 3*(5), 775-780.
- Zaleska, K.J. & Gratton, L. (2000). Development and Fairness of Career Opportunities and its Impact on Commitment and Trust. http://www.London edu/ faculty_ research / Working Papers / Working _ Papers. html.

- Zhang, L. (2006). Thinking styles and the big five personality traits revisited. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*, 1177–1187.